



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/825,928

04/15/2004

Mark Moore

MOM-100

9048

23557

7590

11/16/2006

SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK
A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
PO BOX 142950
GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950

EXAMINER

SPISICH, MARK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1744

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on 3 October 2006. These drawings are approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Holliday et al (USP 6,243,906). The patent to Holliday discloses a cleaning device (10) comprising a handle (12) including a brush (16) as well as a plurality of teeth (36a-36c and 38a-38c) wherein the teeth one blade (32) are longer than the teeth of a second blade (30). Any pair of one of the long teeth and the short tooth immediately behind it would constitute a set of two or more teeth of decreasing length. One could orient the device such that the teeth are "vertically aligned" with the long tooth being above the short tooth.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1744

4. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holliday et al (USP 6,243,906). The patent to Holliday discloses the plural teeth and further discloses the acute angle between the teeth and the "handle". The particular angle would amount to an obvious modification of the prior art., especially given the fact that the claims define the angle as with respect to "the handle", as opposed to the specific portion of the handle disclosed and shown in figure 5.

5. Claims 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holliday et al (USP 6,243,906) in view of Nichols, Jr (USP 3,968,535). The patent to Holliday discloses the invention substantially as claimed with the exception of the absorbent material somewhere on the handle and the teeth and brush on the same end of the handle. The patent to Nichols discloses that is is known in the art of windshield cleaners (the art of Holliday) to provide a combination of a brush (54), scraper (30) and absorbent material (60) somewhere on a handle. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have provided an absorbent material to the device of Holliday so that one more cleaning function could be performed. In addition, the patent to Nichols further discloses that the scraper and the brush be located at the same end of the handle.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 17-22 and 47-51 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 3 October 2006, at least with respect to claim 8, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant indicated that claim 8 had

Art Unit: 1744

been amended to incorporate the subject matter of an allowed dependent claim (#14), while correcting the 112-2nd problem. Firstly, there was never any confusion with regard to the "longitudinal plane A-A'" with respect to the specification or written description of the invention. As such, the examiner questions why the references to this in the specification were removed. In objecting to claim 14 originally, it was assumed that the location of the plane A-A' would be more clearly defined in the claims as being in the specific location shown in the drawings (eg, figure 7). Instead of doing this, the claims were amended to remove any mention to the plane. The result is that claim 8 as amended is much broader than claim 14 originally was.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1744

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Spisich whose telephone number is (571) 272-1278. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (5:30-3:00), Alternate Fri off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran can be reached on (571) 272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Mark Spisich
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1744

MS